

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 18, 23, 28, 29, 33 and 34 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 2, 4-6, 8, 10-17, 19-22, 24-27, and 30-32 have been cancelled. Independent Claims 1, 7, 13, 18, 23, 29, 33, and 34 have been amended to recite the identified network address is a port address of a hub or router through which a venue station is connected to the network infrastructure. These independent claims have also been amended to recite a step of accessing or a component capable of accessing policy data that lists port addresses for authorized venue stations as well as billing information for each venue station. In view of those amendments and the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's thoughtful reconsideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 102: The Examiner rejected Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-16, 18-21, 23-26, 28-31, 33, and 34 as being anticipated by US Pub. 2003/0188186 to Cherry.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for authorizing a network request. The request is routed through a network infrastructure to a network device from one of a plurality of authorized and unauthorized venue stations connected to the network infrastructure. As amended Claim 1 recites the following:

1. communicating with the network infrastructure to identify a network address from which the network request originated, the network address being a port address of a hub or router through which a particular one of the plurality of venue stations is connected to the network infrastructure;
2. accessing policy data, the policy data being electronic data listing a port address and billing information for each authorized venue station;
3. determining if the identified port address is listed by the policy data; and
4. accepting the network request and reporting use data only upon a determination that the identified port address for the particular one of the plurality of venue stations is listed as a port address for an authorized

venue station, the use data being based on the billing information for the particular venue station and usable to charge a fee for acting on the network request.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate limitations found in Claim 6. In particular, Claim 1 now recites accessing policy data that lists a port address and billing information for each authorized venue station. Claim 1 has been further amended to recite the conditional reporting of use data based on the billing information for the particular venue station and usable to charge a fee for acting on the network request. includes billing information for listed authorized venue stations.

It is initially noted that Cherry makes no mention of accessing policy data that lists port addresses for the authorized venue stations. It is further noted that the Examiner admits that Cherry fails to teach or suggest obtaining billing information for an authorized address and reporting use data based on that billing information.

Rejecting Claim 6, the Examiner made a 103(a) rejection citing Cherry in view of US Pub 2003/0014327 to Stantze. Cherry qualifies as prior art only under Section 102(e) as it was published after the filing date of the present application. Pursuant to Section 103(c), therefore, Cherry does not qualify as prior art under §103(a). Hewlett-Packard Development Company (or its predecessor in interest Hewlett-Packard Company) owned Cherry and the present Application at the time of the invention, as is evident from the assignments of Cherry recorded June 11, 2002 (inventors to Hewlett-Packard Co.) and June 18, 2003 (Hewlett-Packard Co. to Hewlett-Packard Development Company) at reel/frame 012996/0394 and 013776/0928, respectively, and the assignment of this Application recorded December 15, 2003 (inventors to Hewlett-Packard Development Co.) at reel/frame 014194/0845

For at least these reasons, Claim 1 and Claim 3 which depends from Claim 1 cannot properly be rejected under §102 or under 103 based on the teachings of Cherry and/or Stantze.

Claim 7 is directed to a method for printing and recites the following:

1. receiving a print request routed through a network infrastructure, the request being received from one of a plurality of authorized and unauthorized venue stations connected to the network infrastructure;
2. communicating with the network infrastructure to identify a network address from which the print request originated, the network address being a port address of a hub or router through which a particular one of the plurality of venue stations is connected to the network infrastructure;
3. accessing policy data, the policy data being electronic data listing a port address and billing information for each authorized venue station;
4. determining if the identified port address is listed by the policy data is; and
5. acting upon the print request and reporting use data only if the identified port address for the particular one of the plurality of venue stations is listed as a port address for an authorized venue station, the use data being based on the billing information for the particular venue station and usable to charge a fee for acting on the print request.

As with Claims 1, Cherry Fails to teach or suggest accessing policy data that lists a port address and billing information for each authorized venue station and reporting use data based on such billing information. Further Cherry does not qualify as prior art to support a §103(a) rejection. For at least these reasons, Claim 7 and Claim 9 which depends from Claim 7 are patentable over the cited references.

Claim 13 is directed to a computer readable medium having instructions for implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so is Claim 13.

Claim 18 is directed to a computer readable medium having instructions for implementing the method of Claim 7. For at least the same reasons Claim 7 is patentable, so is Claim 18.

Claim 23 is directed to a system capable of implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 23 and Claim 28 which depends from Claim 23.

Claim 29 is directed to a system capable of implementing the method of Claim 7. For at least the same reasons Claim 7 is patentable, so is Claim 29.

Claim 33 is directed to a system having various means for implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so is Claim 33.

Claim 34 is directed to a system having various means for implementing the method of Claim 7. For at least the same reasons Claim 7 is patentable, so is Claim 34.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 103: The Examiner rejected Claims 6, 12, 17, 22, 27, and 32 as being unpatentable over Cherry in view of Stanze. Claims 6, 12, 17, 22, 27, and 32 have been cancelled rendering the rejection moot. As noted the limitations of these cancelled claims have been incorporated into the claims from which they once depended. As explained above, §103(c) disqualifies Cherry as prior art under §103(a).

CONCLUSION: The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 18, 23, 28, 29, 33 and 34 are felt to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
James Clough

By /Jack H. McKinney/
Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

October 22, 2007